

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDREW SAMUELS,  
Plaintiff,

v.

LIDO DAO, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-06492-VC](#) (AGT)

**DISCOVERY ORDER**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 171, 172

The Court isn't convinced that the parties exhausted meet-and-confer efforts before filing their joint statement. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 172 at 3 (“[W]hen Defendants offered to meet and confer regarding the relevance of [Plaintiff’s] search strings and the burden of recollecting, reviewing and producing documents through May 2025, Plaintiff refused to have that discussion.”). The parties shall meet and confer further by June 2, 2025.

The Court denies the pending motion to seal. *See* Dkt. 171. The designating party, non-party Dolphin CL, LLC, hasn't persuaded the Court that “specific prejudice or harm will result” if the information in question—excerpts from a message chain in which unidentified individuals discussed one or more contemplated financial transactions—is made public. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2003). Dolphin maintains that public disclosure “carries with it a security risk.” Dkt. 173 at 3. Given that the

excerpts don't identify the parties to the messages, Dolphin's concern is only speculative.

The material provisionally filed under seal must be publicly filed by June 2, 2025.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 27, 2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Alex G. Tse', written over a horizontal line.

Alex G. Tse  
United States Magistrate Judge